E 390
.S77

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SPEECH OF EDW. STANLY,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

ESTABLISHING PROOFS THAT THE

ABOLITIONISTS ARE OPPOSED TO GEN. HARRISON,

AND THAT

GEN. HARRISON IS OPPOSED TO THEIR "UNCONSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS."

Delivered in the House of Representatives, April 13, 1840.

Mr. STANLY said: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I am under the necessity of detaining the committee, in presenting to their consideration the evidence I now have relative to the charge which has been made against General Harrison during this debate—that he is allied to the abolitionists, and that the Emancipator has "raised the Harrison flag."

It will be remembered, I hope, sir, that, when the member from Ohio (Mr. DUNCAN) was making his "by authority" speech, I rose and protested against the irregularity of the debate. He has lead the way. His political friends kept their seats, without raising any objection to his unjust and unjustifiable attack upon the character of the candidate of the people. They are in the majority, and have the control of this House; let them not, therefore, impute the blame to the Whigs, that they consumed time in debates out of order, when one of their own men has set the example. I intend, sir, before I resume my seat, to read a few extracts from the letter published by the member from Ohio, giving his opinions of slavery, that the younger members of Congress may know who it is has undertaken to charge General Harrison with being hostile to the South. I intend the people of the Southern States shall know the feelings and opinions of some of these unworthy revilers of Harrison. I intend to furnish some choice extracts from writings and sayings of Ohio Van Buren men, who are volunteering to assail one who has made greater sacrifices for the Southern country than any other politician now alive.

I understood the member from Ohio to say, that the "Emancipator had raised the Harrison flag;" that Harrison, as proved by one of his own letters, was an abolitionist; and that it was "contemptible to publish garbled extracts intended to suppress or pervert the truth." This has been unblushingly stated in the House of Representatives, and, if uncontradicted, may by some be believed. I deny, and will prove it is untrue, that the "Emancipator has raised the Harrison flag." It is directly the reverse. I deny, and will prove that it is untrue, that Harrison ever admitted he was an abolitionist. I fully admit, and agree with the member from Ohio, that it is contemptible to publish garbled extracts for the purpose of misrepresentation. If I prove he himself has done this, I am relieved from the necessity of uttering any condemnation of it, as he has said it was "contemptible."

I will at once proceed to the proof, as I do not wish to detain the committee by a speech, but only wish to offer a few facts I have collected. It is charged—"the Emancipator, an abolition paper, has raised the Harrison flag." Let the Emancipator speak for itself. An extract from the Emancipator has been frequently quoted to prove that this paper approved of the nomination of General Harrison. I saw the article, and have a copy of the paper before me. I read now the following, as part of it which has been so often referred to. In the Emancipator of December 12, 1839, there is this article:

"THE HARRISBURG CONVENTION.—Well, the agony is over, and HENRY CLAY is—laid upon the shelf. And no man of ordinary intelligence can doubt or deny that it is the anti-slavery feeling of the North which has done it, in connexion with his own ostentatious and infamous pro-slavery demonstrations in Congress. Praise to God for a great anti-slavery victory. A man of high talents, of great distinction, of long political services, of boundless personal popularity, has been openly rejected for the Presidency of this republic, on account of his devotion to slavery.

Set up a monument of progress there. Let the winds tell the tale. Let the slaveholders hear the news. Let foreign nations hear it. Let O'Connell hear it. Let the slaves hear it. A slaveholder is incapacitated for the Presidency of the United States. The reign of the slavocracy is hastening to a close."

Read this alone, and we would be disposed to admit that the Emancipator regarded this nomination as a triumph; but, in the *very same article, in the same column, of the same paper*, the following also appears:

"Whether the cause of human rights has gained any thing in General Harrison, beyond the fact that he is not a slaveholder, we cannot say."

The Emancipator, was not satisfied, therefore, they had gained any thing; General H. was not acknowledged by them as an abolitionist. But the following lines conclude the article from which these extracts are made:

"Many abolitionists have heretofore expressed the belief that the old General has repented of his efforts to extend slavery to Indiana, and his opposition to its extinction in the Missouri Territory; and that he is now not only 'convinced of the great evil,' but willing to favor wise and lawful efforts for its general removal. But we shall wait to hear his sentiments from an authentic source before we believe all this. *The unanimity of the convention in nominating for the second office a more bigoted devotee of colonization and slavery than even Henry Clay, shows that the 'party' is as anxious as ever to testify its unshaken allegiance to the slave power; while the prompt determination of the slaveholding delegates to transfer their support from Clay to Harrison is presumptive evidence that they had satisfied themselves of him.*"

Yes, sir, this is a part of the very same article from which the extract was taken, rejoicing that "Henry Clay was laid upon the shelf." In the same article, the editor remarks that "James Barbour, slaveholder," was president of the convention, and "John Tyler, slaveholder," nominated as Vice President. This was from the first paper published after the Harrisburg nomination. Is this "raising the Harrison flag?"

The Emancipator of December 19, 1839, speaking of General Harrison, says:

"*He is the man of his party, and that party have shown the absoluteness of their subserviency, by nominating a slaveholder, a peculiarly bigoted devotee of slavery, on the same ticket with General Harrison, and now by electing a nullifying slaveholder, from slavebreeding Virginia, for Speaker.*

"But we submit, further, that General Harrison's *principles* are already well known by his deeds, of which we find the following summary in the Rochester Freeman:

"'In December, 1802, while Governor of Indiana Territory, he was president of a convention of the people of that Territory, held at Vincennes, and transmitted to Congress a memorial of the convention, praying that the sixth article of the 'Ordinance of '87', which prohibited slavery there, *might be suspended.* (See Am. State Papers, 1803.) His efforts to make Indiana a slave State were prosecuted for years while he was Governor of that Territory.

"'In 1819, February 16, General Harrison voted, as a member of the House of Representatives, *against* a clause prohibiting the further introduction of slavery in Missouri; and *against* a clause for the further emancipation (at 25) of slaves born within that State. Two days afterwards he voted *against* a clause prohibiting the future introduction of slavery into Arkansas, and *against* the future emancipation of slaves born in Arkansas.

"'So basely did he bow to slavery, that even Ohio was shocked. He was indignantly rejected at the next Congressional election in 1822. The National Intelligencer, of October 20, 1822, says: 'It is confirmed to us that Mr. Gazely is elected in opposition to General Harrison. A friend informs us, which we are sorry to learn, that he was opposed particularly on account of his adherence to that principle of the constitution which secures to the people of the South their pre-existing rights.' It seems, then, that General Harrison claimed for the South the *right* to fasten slavery upon any soil which the nation might have or purchase.

"'He has had but little opportunity to act in a public capacity upon the subject of slavery since that time; but an address from his political friends in Virginia, in 1836, says, 'he is sound to the core on the subject of slavery.'

"Under these circumstances, we submit that conscientious abolitionists are bound to regard the two parties and their candidates as standing precisely on the same ground—that of unlimited subserviency to the dominion of SLAVOCRACY. It is true, General Harrison's personal demonstrations are less recent than Mr. Van Buren's. But they are much stronger, for Mr. Van Buren *helped to send Rufus King to the United States Senate to oppose slavery in Missouri, and he has never attempted to extend slavery to regions where it was already abolished. And, further, the demonstrations of the Harrison party are more recent than those of the other.* And if it said that we should give the old General a chance to repent of his pro-slavery, we reply,

that it belongs to the man who repents to exhibit his own repentance. Certainly there are no circumstances in the case which warrant the slightest presumptions in favor of his repentance. Let him or his friends, if they choose, show wherein his views now differ from his actions in 1802, and 1819, and 1836. And, in default of this, let the friends of human rights come at once to the conviction, that the cause they have espoused is, by Divine Providence, entrusted to their own guardianship, and that, for its success or failure, their country and posterity will hold them responsible."

A part of this article I have quoted in a previous speech; but the extracts are equally appropriate now. Thus we see, that for a period of more than thirty years, General Harrison unflinchingly, and without change, adhered to his opinions of the constitutional rights of the South.

December 12th, the Emancipator said: "We shall wait to hear his sentiments." January 16, 1840, the editor publishes his Vincennes speech with these remarks:

"General Harrison and abolition.—We have long *wondered* at the expectations which seem to have been cherished by some of our associates, that General Harrison, if he should obtain the whig nomination, would show himself so favorable to the anti-slavery cause as to make it possible for conscientious and consistent abolitionists to give him their support. Certain proofs in regard to his views of slavery, which we knew were in existence, have not been within our reach. We have just obtained possession of one of them, which we now lay before our readers, begging that those who insist, first, that all abolitionists are bound always to vote; secondly, that they cannot vote for a friend of slavery; and, thirdly, that it would be a breach of faith for abolitionists to nominate a candidate for the Presidency—will just tell us how we shall contrive to vote at the next Presidential election, in such a manner as not to make child's play of it."

Thus we see that, after "waiting," and having obtained certain proofs of his views in regard to slavery, the Emancipator says it would be "child's play" not to nominate a candidate of their own. The Vincennes speech I will refer to presently. The Emancipator, 16th January, 1840, publishing this speech, remarks:

"We submit this document as plenary proof that the whig convention of 1839 has taken a lesson in tactics from the democratic convention of 1836, pledging its support to the slave power by nominating a Northern man with Southern principles for President."

From the Emancipator of January 30, 1840, I read the following article, to which I invite the attention of those who think the abolitionists favor the cause of Harrison:

"The Harrisburg nominations.—The general surprise and excitement produced by the Harrisburg convention having now subsided, we trust the readers of this paper are prepared to take a calm survey of the matter, and examine its relations to the great question which virtually controls all our American politics.

We hazard no contradiction in saying, that when the convention met, there were very few people north of Pennsylvania, who expected General Harrison would receive the nomination. For this reason, the abolitionists had given themselves less concern about him, and had taken but little pains to ascertain his true position with regard to the slavery question. *We knew, indeed, that he had been a zealous supporter of the slave power in the days of the Missouri controversy, and had done what he could to assist in that grand consummation, by which the free principles of the constitution were trampled down, and the slave interest obtained an acknowledged supremacy in the Government of the nation* Also, that he had assisted in an attempt to violate the solemn *guaranties of the ordinance of '87, older than the constitution itself, by spreading the curse of slavery over the rich valleys and beautiful hills of Indiana.* * * * *We may remark, however, that, so far as we are acquainted, there was not a single known abolitionist present in the Harrisburg convention.*

"Let us now turn our attention to the southern aspect of the proceedings. It is well known that nearly all the Southern delegates, as well as many of the pro-slavery men of the North, went to the convention fully determined to support Henry Clay and nobody else; and many of them were instructed and some of them actually pledged to that effect. And the ground of this determination was, chiefly a belief that the slave interest required that he and no other should receive the support of Southern whigs. *And no one will believe that this determination could have been changed, unless they were furnished with the fullest assurances that the paramount interest would be as well promoted by taking another man* For there is probably not a slaveholding whig who would not have rather the present Administration perpetuated, than the least injury or danger brought upon the darling object of his idolatrous devotion—slavery. And when we find these men so cordially relinquishing their chosen candidate, and so enthusiastically

pledging their support to General Harrison, every one is certain, at once, that something has been said or done in the convention, which has assured the slaveholders that his nomination, and possible election, would be at least as well for slavery as that of Henry Clay. It is true, the Southern delegates continued to vote for Mr. Clay to the very last ballot, and we have no doubt he was their first and heartiest choice, and that they felt they were making a sacrifice—of feeling—in consenting to abandon him. And had they made the manifestations of temper which slaveholders ordinarily exhibit when defeated, we might have been somewhat less confident in our conclusions respecting General Harrison. But instead of manifesting the slightest emotions of chivalry at being so resolutely withstood by the men from the North who were always wont to cower at their frown, we find them turning round as easily as possible to the enthusiastic support of the Northern man, and even, it is said, shedding tears of joy at the happy result! There can be but one conclusion, when we see such men as Benjamin Watkins Leigh, of Virginia, so cordially abandoning the man of their choice, and who was eminently the man of their choice on account of his devotion to the interests of slavery."

In the same article, the Emancipator, quoting a part of his Vincennes speech, remarks: "These extracts show, that so late as 1835, General Harrison retained, with all its bitterness, the spirit of devotion to slavery, which had marked his course when in Congress fifteen years before." The same number of this paper abuses John Tyler, as hostile to abolitionists. I hope it is not necessary to say, no man in his senses accuses him of being an abolitionist. But I should not be surprised to hear this soon.

The same paper remarks, in continuation:

"*The Richmond Whig, the leading Harrison paper in Virginia, in an article on the same subject, January 17th, refers to Harrison's meritorious services to slavery, in* 1818, *when Illinois presented herself for admission as a State with a virtual recognition of slavery incorporated in her constitution. James Tallmadge and Marcus Morton opposed the admission, but Harrison sustained it, on the ground of the right of a State to adopt slavery, notwithstanding the ordinance of* '87. *The Whig also refers to Harrison's support of slavery in Missouri and the Arkansas Territory, and mentions the argument by which he attempted to justify his vote on the latter question, where no constitutional grounds could be alleged. He said the South had equal right with the North to the new territory purchased with the common treasure of the nation, and that to abolish slavery in Arkansas would shut out Southern emigrants. The Whig says that, at that day, caricatures were circulated in Ohio, representing General Harrison in the character of a negro-driver, with his whip, following a gang of slaves in chains.* It closes by declaring, that the true issue before the South now lies 'between a *Northern* man with Southern feelings, and a *Southern* man with Southern feelings.'

"What will abolitionists say to these developments? We ask them, also, to look into those whig papers, in their respective districts, which have heretofore manifested a friendly interest in the anti-slavery cause, and see if they find a single manifestation of anti-slavery spirit since the Harrisburg nomination. Let it be borne in mind, also, that the unanimous rally of all the whig anti-slavery men of Congress in behalf of a nullifying slaveholder for Speaker immediately followed the Harrisburg nomination."

The Emancipator, of February 6th, 1840, says: "The whigs have nominated a Northern man with Southern principles, of the extremest sect, for President, backed by a slaveholder of tried bigotry for Vice President." Thus we have evidence that the abolitionists regard Harrison as a Northern man with Southern principles. Let Mr. Van Buren's friends show what are his Southern principles. I am unacquainted with them.

The next number of this paper, to which I wish to call the attention of those who feel any interest in this matter, is dated March 12th, 1840. This number of this paper is remarkable for its violence. I will read a few extracts:

"A desire to do strict justice, induces us to copy the following rather apologetic account of the relations of General Harrison to the slavery question. Our brother of the Philanthropist is mistaken in supposing that the Emancipator has ever recognised the '*selection* of General Harrison" as 'a concession to the spirit of liberty in the North.' *We declared the 'rejection of Mr. Clay" to be a triumph of abolition; but from the beginning we felt assured that the nomination of Harrison and Tyler was a concession the other way—as definite an act of subserviency to the slave power as has ever been performed by any party.* The manner in which this nomination was received and acquiesced in by the slaveholders, with Benjamin Watkins Leigh at their head, left not a particle of doubt on our mind; and the language of the slave press, with the general conduct of the party managers since, has confirmed our first impressions. It was not necessary that the Harrisburg convention should make any specific 'pledges to the South.' Their nomination was pledge enough, and was so received by the Southern delegates. They

evidently felt that in giving up Henry Clay, they had only sacrificed a favorite *man*, but had rather gained than lost in regard to the strength of their favorite *institution*, which they love more than they do even Henry Clay.

"The Philanthropist, in gently *palliating the atrocity of General Harrison's speech at Vincennes, in* 1835, *omits to* mention his visit to Virginia in 1836, where he went into an elaborate statement of his views on slavery, for which he received a unanimous vote of thanks from the planters, right in the glory of the domestic slave-trade, then so prosperous. And as to the demonstrations of the whig party since the nomination, we should like to know what Dr. Bailey thinks of the votes given for Speaker? And what of the general silence of the whig papers on the subject of slavery?

Now, Mr. Chairman, do you think our constituents, when they read this, will believe this is from the paper which is said to have raised the Harrison flag? What will they think of him who asserts it? But, sir, the same number of this paper, of date March 12, 1840, furnishes additional evidence of the bitterness of feeling cherished by abolitionists towards General Harrison. This paper had contained what it called Harrison's "infamous Vincennes speech," and, in referring to this and other opinions, the Emancipator remarks:

"Will our readers look at the position of General Harrison, as developed on our first page, by those who evidently designed to present it in as fair an aspect as truth would allow? Add to this his avowals to the planters of Virginia in 1836, and the nomination of John Tyler, of Virginia, one of the most bigoted devotees of the slave interest. Add to this the earnestness with which nearly every whig Speaker in Congress has disavowed all sympathy with the *objects* of the abolitionists, and all intention *ever to do any thing* for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and we have a full view of the national policy of the whig party on this subject."

Here we see the abolitionists dissent with the views of the whig party, and the "whig Speakers in Congress, who have disavowed all sympathy with the objects of the abolitionists."

But the same paper continues, as follows:

"We have, we think, adduced sufficient evidence to prove, that the devising of this ticket was a concession to the slave power, satisfactory to the most zealous champions of that interest. It was, therefore, a sacrifice of the greater to the lesser; an agreement to surrender the slave question for the lesser and comparatively *insignificant* objects that are now in *litigation between the rival parties, the principal one being that of ins and outs. It is plain* that slavery can never be abolished, nor its encroachments successfully resisted, by yielding to its claims. *Hence, the fact that the nomination of Harrison and Tyler was satisfactory to the slaveholders, on slavery grounds, is proof that it was a surrender of abolition.*

"*By recurring to General Harrison's expressed views with regard to the abolition of slavery, we find that they amount to just this: a vague sense of the evil of slavery in its effects upon the prosperity of the country, and a willingness to devote the resources of the nation to the purchase and expatriation of slaves, WHENEVER THE SLAVE STATES SHALL REQUEST IT;* in other words, the vain dreams which prevailed a dozen years ago, and which the developments of 'modern abolition' have partially dissipated. *For abolitionists to hold up these notions as anti-slavery, is, therefore, to abandon all we have gained, and to bring us back precisely where we started seven years ago.*

"We grant that it would be gratifying to see Mr. Van Buren so deservedly rebuked for his servility, as he would be should he lose his re-election *on that ground.* But we do not see how a vote for another ticket, equally servile, could admit of such a construction. We, therefore, conceive, that as between the two tickets, in themselves considered, abolitionists have no choice. Something may be gained by a change, as a change, by weakening the present coalition with the slave power, but we should deprecate the purchase of this incidental advantage at *so great an expense of principle as would be involved in the support of the Harrison ticket by abolitionists.*

"We are suprised at the attempt, in the Philanthropist of March 3, to show that the appending of Tyler to the ticket is a matter of no moment. The slaveholders never reason so. They have not been careful for twenty-five years to secure the casting vote in the Senate without a reason. It is that which makes the ticket so acceptable to the slave power. It is that which marks it with the ineffaceable brand of servility.

"*We have said but a part of what we intended; but close now by expressing our conviction that the support of the Harrisburg nomination by the body of the abolitionists would be a surrender to the political dominion of the slave power as irresistible, and an abandonment of all that we have gained. It is giving up to slavery its most important support and defence—political power. It is, in fact, a renewal of the Missouri compromise, under circumstances more disgraceful, if not more disheartening than that melancholy occurrence.* And the slaveholders would quiet themselves to bear our northern denunciations on learning that we mean nothing by them, and will do nothing in conformity to them. *While, on the other hand, should*

the Harrisburg nomination be defeated, by the withholding of abolition votes, it would, we believe, forever after prevent a resort to such a measure of circumvention to baffle the vigilance or gull the sagacity of the uncompromising friends of liberty."

Although this is a long article, I prefer giving so much of it, that I may do justice to those who never do justice towards us. It will be seen this paper charges the President with "servility" to the South, and speaks of both tickets as "equally servile." I might easily have garbled this, and have omitted all that referred to the President, but it is "contemptible" to garble extracts. I wish only to deal with truth. The whig cause—the Harrison cause, scorns the help of falsehood. I defy any honest man, who knows truth from falsehood, to read this article and assert that this paper has raised the Harrison flag.

The next number of this paper, from which I wish to read an extract, is dated April 2, 1840, published but a few days ago. This paper, like the Globe, censures the Cincinnati committee for their letter to the Oswego association, and makes use of some of the same terms which, I think, I have seen in the Globe.

This committee, as far as I know, had no authority for writing such a letter, from General Harrison; but supposing they had, what do we learn from their letter? They tell us, "the General's views, in regard to all the important and exciting questions of the day, have heretofore been given to the public, fully and explicitly; and, that those views, whether connected with constitutional or other questions of a general interest, *have undergone no change.*"

The committee also say, in their answer to the Oswego association:

"The committee are now publishing, in pamphlet form, many of the former expressed opinions of the General, and facts and incidents connected with his past life, which will be forwarded to you at an early period."

These facts have been published in pamphlet form, and in that pamphlet is the *Vincennes speech.* As far as the committee have answered, we are to regard this speech as containing General Harrison's present opinions.

There is no foundation for the assertion that General Harrison has changed his opinions; and if he had, I would not rely upon him. Why could he not change again and again? I am willing to regard his opinions as expressed in his Cheviot speech, in his Vincennes speech, and in his letter to Mr. Sloo of New Orleans, as being his opinions now. Abolitionists who are determined to oppose Harrison, regard his "infamous" Vincennes speech, as the "ultimatum of the whig party on the subject of abolition." I have no objection.

But, let the paper speak for itself. From the Emancipator of April 2d:

"General Harrison and the South.—Most of our readers are aware that a letter of inquiry on the subject of slavery was addressed to General Harrison, during the Presidential canvass in 1836, by some gentlemen in Vermont, to which he promised an explicit reply, *but the reply never came. From the silence which was observed on the subject, many abolitionists were led to believe that he was personally favorable to our objects, and only kept in silence from prudential considerations, and that he would keep himself entirely impartial and free from the entanglements in which the slave power has held our statesmen of all parties for the last twenty years. Hence the suspense which most of the abolition editors maintained respecting him. The first announcement of his nomination by the Harrisburg convention, notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances of that nomination, and the appending of a peculiarly bigoted devotee of slavery to the ticket ought to have satisfied every mind at once that it was a pro-slavery nomination, which, if successful, would bind the whig party, as a party, to the same shameful subserviency to slavery with their rival party.*

"To show the present position of General Harrison, who, it is admitted by all, cannot be elected without the votes of abolitionists, we call attention to a couple of facts. Not long since, a letter of inquiry was addressed to General Harrison by the chairman and secretary of a meeting at Oswego, New York, asking an expression of his views on several subjects; among others, asking whether he was *in favor of receiving and referring* petitions for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; a point on which he has never said a word, to our knowledge.

"These inquiries were answered, not by General Harrison himself, but by a committee of gentlemen at Cincinnati, who seem to have taken his opinions into their keeping. We *give the letter* in full, having italicized a few sentences which show *that the infamous* Vincennes address is to be regarded as *the ultimatum* of the whig party on the subject of abolition."

The same paper also remarks:

"Now it will be observed that all interests were represented at Harrisburg except the abolition interest, which had not, so far as we know, an individual representative."

In the Emancipator of January 30, (before read,) the editor says:

"We may remark, however, that so far as we are acquainted, there was not a single known abolitionist present in the Harrisburg convention."

On the 2d of April, this assertion is repeated. Abolitionists, therefore, could not have exercised any influence over the Harrisburg convention.

Thus much for the Emancipator. Now, I ask, who that regards truth, who that values his own character, dare assert that this paper, which has denounced General Harrison from the first week he was nominated until this time, has raised the Harrison flag?

Let us now see what is the opinion entertained by other abolitionists. The "Friend of Man" is an abolition paper, published in Utica, New York. After the election of Mr. Tallmadge to the Senate of the United States, the Friend of Man, of date the 22d January, 1840, contained the following article:

"On the whole, we congratulate the friends of the cause, that the delusive spell which has led so many abolitionists in this State to connect their prospects of success with the predominancy of the whig party, is at length broken. The dream is over, and the illussion has vanished. It can never return."

The "Rochester Freeman," another abolition paper, also denounced Harrison, as I have shown before, in an article to which I referred just now.

Next I will give a few extracts from the "Liberator," an abolition paper published in Boston. This paper, of February 7th, 1840, published the Vincennes speech, with these remarks:

"It shows conclusively that General Harrison is no more worthy of the support of abolitionists than Martin Van Buren or Henry Clay. They cannot give him their suffrages without grossly violating their principles and giving the lie to all their solemn professions. *They will not do it.* They will scatter their votes, and thus, if possible, defeat the choice of Presidential electors; or, if they cannot produce this result, they will at least throw the responsibility of electing a pro-slavery President upon those to whom it appropriately belongs.

"General Harrison's course on this subject since his first nomination, has been neither frank nor honorable."

Here I might have "garbled" again, and have omitted this censure of Mr. Van Buren; but I prefer to give the whole truth.

From the Liberator of April 3d, 1840, I see an article entitled spurious democracy. The Liberator quotes as follows, from some political meeting:

"SPURIOUS DEMOCRACY.—At a meeting of the Royalston Democratic (?) Association, in this State, January 8th, 1840, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That modern whigism, federalism, toryism, bankism, and abolitionism, are all united as one common enemy against the national Administration; therefore, it is the duty of every democrat to use every honorable means in his power, to disseminate political truth, as avowed by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson and Van Buren, which is *equal rights and equal privileges.*"

This sounds so much like the language we sometimes hear on this floor, that I am tempted to believe it was written here and sent to the Royalston Association. But the Liberator dissents from this, and says:

"This is a rare specimen of logic, as well as of veracity. *To assert that abolitionism is allied with whigism, is not only a silly falsehood, but a reproach to democracy. Abolitionism goes for 'equal rights and equal privileges'—'therefore, it is the duty of every democrat' to be an open and uncompromising abolitionist, or else confess that he is a hypocrite or a knave.*"

For once I agree with the Liberator, and pronounce this a "silly falsehood."

In the Liberator of April 24th, published after these remarks were made, there is the following article:

"As for ourselves, we are satisfied that General Harrison is as rotten as any slaveholder in the land, on the subject of slavery, as facts showing this to be the case are daily coming to hand."

I have before me a number of another abolition paper, published in Boston, dated January 30, 1840, called "The Abolitionist." This paper, publishing an extract from the Vincennes speech, remarks:

"For the whole, recur to our last paper. We have no better light than this in regard to Mr. Harrison's views on the great question. We have seen no recantation. His speech at Vincennes was delivered after the principles and measures of the abolitionists had been fully explained to the community, and after the '*force of public opinion*' and the '*frowns*' of our fellow-citizens were well understood to imply brick-bats, tar and feathers, rotten eggs, and *lynch* justice. He not only denies that the North has any thing to do with slavery, but he is for smothering and gagging her free citizens under the folds of the *compact*. The party that has nominated Mr. Harrison, is certainly desirous of votes. A single vote may be their victory. They have certainly no votes to lose. If they could present a stronger inducement to abolition voters, why have they not done it? Why do they not present us with some document to show that their candidate has reconsidered his decision—that he is now ready, in case of his election, to use his official influence in favor of liberty? Why do they wish us to take this point for granted? The answer is obvious, they have nothing to show. *Mr. Harrison succumbs to slavery.* He is willing, nay, anxious to become the tool of the South to *stop* the abolition movements."

Now, is it not too ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, that it should again and again be asserted on this floor, that General Harrison is supported by the abolitionists? I shall in charity suppose these accusations have been made in ignorance. If they are repeated, I shall conclude they are made with malice aforethought, and in a shameful disregard of truth. But the same article of this paper has more still against Harrison. Hear it further:

"If there is any truth in the principle contended for, and adopted by a great majority of the Albany convention, that abolitionists should not give their votes for any *pro-slavery* candidate, now is the time to act up to it. To all who do not renounce that principle we need not say another word to persuade them *not* to vote for Harrison."

Here Harrison is regarded by "The Abolitionist," more than a month after his nomination, as the "*pro-slavery candidate.*" Not only is the editor of this paper opposed to the whig candidate, on account of his defence of and attachment to the South, but he is a regular sub-Treasury abolitionist. He approves "the disjunction of bank and State." Let him speak for himself. From the same paper I read as follows:

"We speak intelligently and feelingly on this subject. Setting aside the great question of slavery, we are a democrat. We go for the strict construction of constitutions and the most sparing grants of power. We deny the right of Government to create monopolies any farther than is necessary to secure a due reward to discovery and invention. We approve of the disjunction of bank and State, and hold that giving corporations the power to *create money* is only giving legality to swindling. But the *chattelizing of* MAN so overshadows all these matters, that we lose sight of them for the sake of first restoring inalienable rights to THREE MILLIONS."

The Cazenovia Abolitionist, published in New York, joins the chorus against Harrison. In a number of that paper, published on the 8th of January, 1840, the editor remarks, of the whig party:

"Let abolitionists beware how they cast their influence in favor of a party of no principles, or any principles, as the interest of the party, not the country, shall demand. The recent nominations of the party, of one of the meanest apologists for slavery, for President of the United States, and a slaveholder, and probably a slavebreeder, for Vice President, are enough to open the eyes of the blind as to the whig party being the handmaid of abolition."

The same paper, speaking of General Harrison, whom it calls a mean apologist for slavery, also says:

"The abolitionists cannot aid his election, unless they betray their principles, as their whig friends have done, in electing a sub-Treasury Speaker, connected as he (Harrison) is with John Tyler, a slaveholder, for Vice President."

Surely, sir, I have shown enough to "open the eyes of the blind" as to the abolitionists being opposed to General Harrison.

Surely, sir, no honest conscientious man can say now that the abolition papers support the cause of Harrison. I will trouble the committee, sir, with but a few extracts from one more paper. It has been said, by gentlemen, Southern gentlemen, here, that the Philanthropist, published at Cincinnati, is in favor of General Harrison's election. I am able, sir, to show this is altogether wrong. I might simply deny this, and call for proof; but instead of entering into a contest here, with those who can wilfully and deliberately accuse Harrison of being an abo-

litionist, of merely rebutting assertion with assertion, I choose rather to nail the charge to the counter.

The Philanthropist, of February 4, says:

"Let us not be misunderstood. We do not hold ourselves responsible for the objections. We are not the advocate of General Harrison nor any other candidate for the Presidency. Our simple desire is to present to the reader both sides of the question."

The same paper, after publishing some extracts from one of his letters or speeches, remarks:

"We have thus given our readers all we know concerning this matter, and leave the whole subject to them, without comment. The interest of our cause, we believe, does not demand from us, *at this time*, any expression of opinion. It is proper, however, that we should guard ourselves by declaring—that we are no *partisan;* that we advocate no man's claims to the Presidency; that we belong to no political party; and, that, in our belief, the success of abolition efforts does not now depend on the success of either whigs or democrats; or, indeed, on the action of any *political* party whatsoever."

A number of the Philanthropist, of 24th March, 1840, publishes an editorial, entitled "Defining my position." Referring to General Harrison this paper remarks:

"No sooner was this gentleman announced as a candidate for the Presidency, than some of the anti-slavery prints began to hunt up every circumstance which could tell against him in the minds of abolitionists. He was denounced unsparingly. The rest of the anti-slavery papers soon joined in the general clamor. We thought they were too hasty. *No harm would have come from waiting a while, and giving General H. a chance of revoking his evil speeches about abolitionists.* We did not feel free to commit ourselves. All the information we could get on General Harrison's sentiments or doings, in regard to slavery, we laid before our readers, forbearing any expression of opinion, not assuming to give advice, and answering questions in such a way as not to pledge ourselves pro or con.

"This course has strangely been mistaken by a highly esteemed friend. In a letter, of recent date, he accuses us of having concluded to go for Harrison and Tyler—of having committed ourselves openly and decidedly in their cause.

"The fact that our friend, a man of candor and temperate judgment, (although an advocate for a third party,) should have so misconstrued our course, leads us to suspect that others may have imbibed the same notion.

"*This leads us to make an avowal, which we had intended to defer. It is, that unless we can have better evidence than is now in our possession, that General Harrison, if elected, will act in behalf of liberty against slavery, we cannot give him our vote.*"

From this we learn distinctly, that from the first some of the anti-slavery prints unsparingly denounced General Harrison. That the rest of the anti-slavery papers soon joined in the general clamor, and that abolitionists admit General Harrison has not revoked his evil speeches about abolitionists.

The same paper also says:

"In conclusion, we remark, that, until we can see clearly how we are to benefit our cause by meddling greatly with the present Presidential contest, we shall for the most part let it alone. When a man cannot see his way before him he had better stop till the light shines."

The Philanthropist, of April 24, 1840, publishes the letter of the Cincinnati committee, and remarks:

"The pamphlet promised by the committee is now published. It contains General Harrison's letter in reply to the accusation of pro-slavery, published in 1822, and his notorious Vincennes speech. The necessary inference is, that the sentiments expressed in this speech, concerning abolition and abolitionists, he still holds. In fact the committee assures us, that the 'General's views in regard to all the important and exciting questions of the day, have heretofore been given to the public, fully and explicitly, and that those views, whether connected with constitutional or other questions of any general interest, have undergone no change.' To show what those views are, they publish, among other things, his Vincennes speech."

After this the Philanthropist says:

"We had thought that General Harrison was too independent a man to truckle to the slaveholder; but, with the rest of our public men, he has passed under the yoke."

Here, sir, I leave this part of the subject. And I assert that, as far as I have seen the abolition papers, not one has raised the Harrison flag—not one is satisfied with his opinions on this subject.

Nor is this the only evidence that the abolitionists are opposed to General Harri-

son. Some of the bitterest revilers of the South, some of those who have expressed sentiments, conceived only in hearts full of diabolical malignity, are violent in their opposition. I allude to the well-known and publicly-expressed opinions of the Van Buren Senator from Ohio, and his colleague (Mr. DUNCAN) on this floor. I shall refer to these anti-slavery patriots presently. The abolitionists, in their conventions, have denounced General Harrison. I will offer several instances of this. At an anti-slavery convention for Western New York, held at Arcade, Genesee county, January 29, 1840, seven or eight hundred persons present, with delegates from the States of New York and Pennsylvania, the following, among other resolutions, were passed:

"8. *Resolved*, That, in our opinion, General William H. Harrison ought not to receive the vote of any freeman in the United States for the office of President thereof, because he has apostatized from the faith of his father, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and habitually made war upon the most essential of human rights:

"1st. In urging the National Legislature to suspend the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which he did, as president of a convention held therein in 1802, for the purpose of introducing it there, though the prohibition had been solemnly enacted by the unanimous vote of the old continental Congress, and ratified by the first Congress under the new constitution, with only one dissenting vote.

"2d. In giving his influence and his vote, as a member of Congress, in 1819, in favor of admitting the State of Missouri into the Union with a provision to legalize slavery therein, and in doing the same, during the same year, in respect to the Territory of Arkansas.

"3d. In misrepresenting the abolitionists and the constitution, to their prejudice, and to the injury of the great rights of free inquiry—freedom of speech and of the press—in a speech delivered at Vincennes, in 1835, in which also, in effect, he encouraged *the lawless violence of mobs* to suppress the movements of the abolitionists, though they were rightful and constitutional, by declaring that they 'should be immediately stopped * * by the force of public opinion, and and that cannot too soon be brought into operation.'

"4th. In authorizing a committee of his political friends, in Virginia, in 1836, for the sake of procuring him the support of slave owners, in the election for the Presidency then pending, to say that 'he was sound to the core on the subject of slavery.'

"5th. In consenting this year to be run as a candidate for the Presidency on a ticket which cannot receive a vote which is not at the same time given for a slave holder as Vice President."

In pursuance of a call at this Arcade convention, the abolitionists met in Albany, on the 1st of April, to discuss the question of an independent nomination of abolition candidates. Delegates were in attendance from the States of Vermont, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. This convention nominated James Birney, of New York, and Thomas Earle, *(an active Van Buren partisan,)* of Pennsylvania, as candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency. Among other resolutions they passed the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Presidential nominations of the democratic and whig parties, (so called,) being equally satisfactory to the supporters of perpetual slavery, and being both headed by men who have publicly avowed a higher regard for the pretended rights of slaveholders than for the real rights of freemen, cannot be supported by abolitionists without doing great, if not fatal, violence to their principles."

The Emancipator of April 9, 1840, publishing these proceedings, remarks:

"The letter of the Cincinnati committee was read, reaffirming the sentiments and determinations heretofore avowed by General Harrison.

This letter seems to have convinced the abolitionists that General Harrison's opinions, as made known in his speeches at Cheviot and Vincennes, are unaltered and unalterable. It is hard to settle, whether this letter has given greater offence to the federal spoilers of the Van Buren party or to the abolitionists.

The Emancipator remarks of Mr. Birney:

"He is, in clearness of vision, soundness of judgment, and purity of patriotism, better fitted to adorn the high office for which he is nominated, and to build an enduring memorial of praise by his administration of public affairs, than either of his rival candidates."

I have now furnished evidence enough to satisfy any sensible man that the Harrisburg nomination was not only not brought about by abolitionists, but has met their decided and irreconcilable hostility. I defy any Van Buren federalist in this House to produce any proof that abolitionists are pleased with this nomination.

I have thus far, Mr. Speaker, proceeded to show that the abolition papers were opposed to the whig candidate. I have also satisfactorily shown that in their conventions, composed of hundreds, they have unsparingly denounced Harrison and Tyler.

I will now, sir, exhibit the pretension of some of the Van Buren party in Congress to "Southern principles."

The member from Ohio, (Mr. DUNCAN,) who has brought this subject into discussion here, published a letter in 1838, which I commented on in the last Congress. As this may have been overlooked in some parts of our country, and as some of the younger members of this House may not have seen this letter, I will again give a few extracts. My reason for this is, that the author of this infamous letter is furnished with materials to manufacture speeches for the country, and that he has, with unparalleled audacity, undertaken to charge Harrison with being allied with the abolitionists.

I will only remark as to this letter, that the author acknowledged it on this floor.

This letter is signed Alex. Duncan, written by a supporter of Mr. Van Buren, who charges William Henry Harrison with being an abolitionist!

Hear the following:

"There is no man living, perhaps, who is more deadly hostile to slavery than I am. My feelings, my education, the circumstances that have surrounded me through life, together with my principles of what I believe to constitute the natural and political rights of man, all conspire to make me abhor it as one of the greatest evils on the face of the earth.

"Yes, greater in its moral effects and corrupting tendencies than all other human evils put together. It is not only a moral and political evil within itself, nor intrinsically so of the darkest and most damning character, but in all its bearings and effects calculated to produce the most fatal effects on both the moral and political institutions of the country.

"It is an evil that has, does now, and will in all time to come while it exists, involve in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder, and death. For the truth of what I say as to its present effects upon the institutions of our country, I have only to refer you to a view of the slave States in our Union, and a comparison between the relative condition of the improvements of them and the free States. You see the free States happy and flourishing, to the admiration and astonishment of all who see them. Public improvements and private prosperity are swift, and head and head in the race; while, on the other hand, poverty, lean and hungry sterility, and squalid wrethchedness, seem to cover the face of the land in many parts where slave institutions have a residence.

"Cross the line that separates the free from the slave States, or stand upon it and look across the former, you will see comparatively all life, all happiness, all prosperity, both public and private; but turn your eyes upon the latter and survey it, every thing material (except a few of the wealthy proprietors) bears the impress of poverty and dilapidation—all look as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovation.

"The anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest upon every thing upon which you can cast your eyes. Every prospect seems withered and wilted by the frown and disapprobation of avenging justice and violated humanity. In short, almost every institution, every prosperity, public and private, seems to be sickening and dying from the corrupting and corroding effects of lavery. But the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution."

"*Questions 2d.* Are you opposed to the admission of any new State into the Federal Union whose constitution tolerates slavery?

"*Answer.* I am."

Here, sir, is proof of the patriotic, kind, charitable, and humane feelings of this friend of Mr. Van Buren for the slaveholding States! Here is the man who charges William Henry Harrison, a native of Virginia, a son of a signer of the Declaration of Independence, with being an abolitionist! This is the man who accuses Harrison, who sacrificed his seat in Congress in 1819 for the South, who so often risked his life in the service of his country—this is the man who charges the Southern people with being encouragers of "theft, robbery, and murder," that also accuses General Harrison of favoring abolition! I will forbear further comment.

Take another instance: Mr. Benjamin Tappan, the Van Buren Senator from Ohio, was a judge in that State. I have before me a volume entitled "Tappan's Reports." The case is Barrett *vs.* Jarvis, on the 212th page. One man said of another he was "akin to negroes." For this an action of slander was commenced, and Tappan delivered the opinion, which he afterwards prepared for publication.

There can, therefore, be no mistake as to the correctness of the report as made by him. Speaking of the negroes, in this report, he says:

"If the action does not lie for imputing a want of moral virtue, can it lie for imputing a consanguinity with any particular race of men? for saying of another that he has a drop of African blood in his veins? that he is of kin, in some degree, remote or near, to the negroes—to that race of men who have been, for ages, the victims of a bloody and unrelenting avarice, and who are bound down to the ground, and trodden under foot by oppression, so wide and so enormous that no man can for a moment contemplate their situation without the deepest commiseration and horror—commiseration for their sufferings, and horror at the immense mass of wickedness and crime which holds them in subjection?

"I know of no principle of ethics or law which would forbid a descendent of the fair-haired and ruddy Teutone from marrying the swarthy native of Africa."

This language is very proper from one who has refused to present abolition petitions! But, in this refusal, Tappan has at least the merit of consistency. He does not wish to abolish slavery by legislation, or any peaceable means. He likes Nat. Turner's plan, which met his decided approbation. Some time since, when I referred to this man's declarations, a gentleman from Ohio asked me for my authority, and I then said if his Senator would deny it I would prove it. Now, sir, I should be glad to be called on again for the authority. But this I know will not be done. I must, therefore, produce it voluntarily. I hold in my hand, sir, a letter written by James Collier, of Steubenville, where Tappan lives, in which he gives a conversation he had with Tappan relative to abolition. In this conversation this man showed he had a heart dead to all the dictates of humanity. Mr. Collier says:

"In the conversation alluded to, Judge Tappan observed, 'that as he was returning from Columbus, he was waited upon at Zanesville, by a committee from the State Abolition Society, then in session at Putnam, with a request that he would accept some appointment, or some office, (what particular office I do not now recollect,) from the society.' The Judge stated that he declined, and assigned as a reason, that he disapproved of the course they were taking; 'but,' said he, 'I told them if they wanted five hundred dollars to purchase arms and ammunition, to put into the hands of the blacks that they might free themselves, I would give them the money.' I then asked him if he had reflected upon the consequences of such a step; that insurrection would be the inevitable result; and that he might thereby put in peril the lives of his connexions and neighbors. He inquired how? To which I replied, that the President was bound, by his oath of office, to suppress insurrections, and, to do that, was authorized to call out the whole armed force of the country. He remarked, that the President would do no such thing. To this I replied, that the President had ordered the troops to Southampton, and would do it again, if necessary. I then said, 'Judge, I think I can put you a case where you would go yourself.' 'Let me hear your case, Colonel,' said he. 'Suppose, sir,' I observed, 'that the county of Brooke, opposite to us, in Virginia, contained a dense population of slaves; that they should rise up against their masters, and that you should be standing with your neighbors on one side of the river, and see them marching down on the other side, burning and destroying every thing within their reach, and murdering, without distinction, men, women, and children, and that our friends and acquaintances should call upon us for assistance, would not you go?' 'No by God,' said he, 'I would not, and would disinherit any child I have that would go!"

This conversation was held since the Southampton insurrection. And this is a warm friend of Mr. Van Buren's, and charges General Harrison's friends with being allied with abolitionists!

Mr. J. H. Hallock writes—"He (Tappan) habitually denounced slavery and slaveholders; his expressions were very strong, such as—'that the slaves ought to rise and cut their masters' throats;' 'if they (the slaves) should rise, he would not aid in subduing them, but would rather aid them.'"

Mr. D. S. Collier, in a letter dated March 6, 1840, confirms the statements of Mr. Hallock and Mr. James Collier. D. S. Collier says:

"In a conversation between the Judge (Tappan) and a gentleman then resident of this place, but now of Baltimore, on the subjects of slavery, this case was presented to the Judge: 'Suppose, sir, we should see the slaves rising against their masters, on the opposite side of the river, (Virginia,) and about to succeed in subduing them, or in cutting their throats, would you not interfere to prevent this, and save their lives?' To which he replied, in substance, 'that if he interfered at all, it would be to supply the slaves with ammunition."

Mr. D. S. Collier lives in Steubenville. I have these original letters. I dare any supporter of this Administration to contradict them. Is it not an honor to

General Harrison that such monsters should oppose him? General Harrison said, in his Cheviot speech, that the measures of the abolitionists, if successful, would produce scenes which only an "incarnate devil" could look upon with approbation. Sir, he did not know Ben. Tappan, the Van Buren Senator from Ohio. And this is the man, a cherished friend of this Administration, who accuses General Harrison's friends with favoring abolition! Does the political history of the world afford such another instance of malignity and of audacity? But I have more proof still. I have before me the *original* "Western Herald and Steubenville Gazette," published in *September* 1837, sent to me from Ohio, in which Mr. James Means publishes a letter corroborating the statements of Messrs. Collier and Hallock. *Besides Mr. Means is a Van Buren man*, and this publication was not intended for any slaveholding people, and was published before Tappan was in Congress. In this Mr. Means says:

"There is another thing. I consider him the worst kind of an abolitionist, as he holds to doctrines the most mischievous and absurd on the subjects of slavery. I believe it could be proved that he has said he would give $500 to purchase arms to put in the hands of the slaves to free themselves; and that they ought to cut their masters' throats. He has also said, if the slaves were butchering men, women, and children, on the opposite side of the river, he would not lift a finger to rescue them; and that he would disinherit a son who would offer to go to their relief. Now, although not an advocate for slavery, I would not support any man for office, who entertains such inhumane feelings and opinions as these."

How well qualified such a wretch is to be a reviler of General Harrison! What an excellent instrument Southern Van Buren men have selected to charge General Harrison's friends of favoring abolition! It is a shame such a creature should be allowed to sit in this Capitol. And this is the man of "invulnerable principles," as the Globe says, in whose hands the rights of the people would be safe!

But he is an object of pity. The fiendish malignity of his soul must have banished all the nobler feelings of man's nature; his rancorous hatred of his fellow-man must debar him of all the enjoyments which feelings of charity and a quiet conscience can alone bestow—feelings without which life must be any thing but a blessing. I leave him for the present. I make no apology for bringing up his sayings and doings to the public gaze. He has endeavored by vile slander to identify General Harrison with abolition. I have repelled the falsehood; and, unless I am misinformed, I can furnish other things not much better than that which I have given to-day. I leave his Southern Van Buren friends to circulate his speeches, and to regale themselves in listening to his conversation, and dwelling with satisfaction on his interesting countenance—a countenance from whose gaze charity turns away with horror, and mercy flies afrighted—a countenance whose repulsive obliquity is a fair index of the rancorous venom which fills his soul.

At a convention of Van Buren men in Indiana, in 1836, which assembled at Indianapolis on the 8th January, an address was published, and, among other objections to General Harrison, the convention charges him with endeavoring to introduce slavery in Indiana.

The address, after giving other objections, calls this a "*grave* objection." It proceeds then to state that, in 1803, when he was Governor of Indiana, when invested with almost unlimited powers, he, "in conjunction with the two Territorial judges," made a law compelling all negroes, coming into that Territory bound to service, to perform the same.

This Van Buren convention also charges him with approving bills of the Territorial Legislature in 1805 and 1807, which, the convention states, the Supreme Court of Indiana have decided to be of no validity, because "*they authorized slavery.*" The address of this convention then concludes with this language: "*What claims for political support has that man on the people of Indiana who dimmed her escutcheon with the foul blot of slavery, and desecrated that soil with a degraded population which the fathers of the republic had decreed should remain forever the exclusive and hallowed abode of freemen.*"

My friend from Indiana, (Mr. PROFFIT,) who called my attention to this, in-

forms me the address was written by James Whitcomb, Esq., who then lived in Indiana, but who has since been brought to this city, and is now Commissioner of the General Land Office, at a comfortable salary of three thousand a year! Among other prominent persons, there were four land office receivers, one now elector on the Van Buren ticket in Indiana, Geo. Boon; one Indian agent; and the Secretary of State and Treasurer of State in Indiana. One of these men, during this session, has been appointed receiver at a land office.

Is not this sufficient to satisfy any man that abolitionists oppose Harrison? Why do the supporters of Mr. Van Buren bring "grave objections" against him, because he advocated the rights of the South? Are not these accusers and vilifiers of General Harrison themselves enemies of the South? And, if so, why are they appointed to office by Mr. Van Buren? Well may the Emancipator remark, with exultation, "that the honors paid to Legget, (the abolitionist whom Mr. Van Buren sent on a foreign mission,) and the election of Morton as Governor of Massachusetts, *and other little matters*, show that his party do not mean to reject, definitively, the support of abolitionists at the North." What the "other little matters" are those acquainted with Van Buren abolitionists can answer—probably a promise to the editor of the Emancipator of a good office.

I finish with this branch of the subject. I have thus far shown that abolitionists are opposed to General Harrison. The abolition papers, the abolitionists who wish to forward emancipation by reasoning, and the cut-throat abolitionists are opposed to him. Why is this? I propose to give a few reasons.

Harrison's hostility to abolition.

In 1819, when Missouri applied for admission into the Union, a bill was reported, which contained this clause:

"*And provided, also,* That the further introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude be prohibited, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall be duly convicted; and that all children of slaves, born within the said State, after the admission thereof into the Union, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of 25 years."

It was proposed to strike out this section. The whole country was convulsed with this discussion. Mr. Jefferson said, it alarmed him like a fire-bell in the night. Mr. Rufus King (whom Mr. Van Buren supported) was the leader of the party which proposed to admit Missouri with this restriction. Every Southern man was opposed to it.

A motion was made to strike out this part of the resolution:

"*And provided, also,* That the further introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude be prohibited, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall be duly convicted."

Upon this vote General Harrison voted with the South. A motion was then made to strike out this part of the resolution:

"And that all children of slaves, born within the said State, after the admission thereof into the Union, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of 25 years."

Upon this also, as upon all other votes touching this question, General Harrison voted with the South.

The following were the Representatives from North Carolina in Congress at that time: Jos. H. Bryan, Will. Davidson, Chas. Fisher, W. N. Edwards, Thos. Hall, Jas. Owen, Lemuel Sawyer, Thos. Settle, Jesse Slocumb, Jas. S. Smith, Jas. Stewart, Felix Walker, and Lewis Williams. Eight of these gentlemen still live. They can bear testimony to these facts. General Harrison voted with them on that occasion. For this the abolitionists have never forgiven him. The House, by a majority of two or three votes, refused to strike out this restriction, and, on account of this, the bill was lost, and Missouri was not admitted until the next year.

General Harrison acted from the deliberate conviction of his judgement and the dictate of his conscience. He returned to his people, and *lost his seat in Congress on account of this vote.* He knew the risk he incurred. I learn from a respectable source in North Carolina that the honorable Thos. Settle (now judge

of the Superior Courts in North Carolina) recently said that, "on the night before the question was taken on the bill to admit Missouri, without restriction, General Harrison said to him, 'I have often risked my life in the field in defence of my country, and I shall to-morrow risk my political life in favor of the Union of the States.'" What a glorious example! How worthy was such conduct of a native of Virginia—a son of a signer of the Declaration of Independence!

In the fall of 1822, General Harrison was a candidate, and was opposed on account of his votes in behalf of the rights of the South.

The gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. HOPKINS,) among others, I regret to perceive, seems to have forgotten what was due to his own character for fairness, and has published a garbled account of the letter written by General Harrison at that time. The letter appears in the gentleman's circular as one of recent date, and does great injustice to General Harrison.

[Mr. HOPKINS explained, by saying, in the paper in which he saw the extract he had published, it stood alone; he had never seen the whole letter.]

Mr. STANLY said he was glad to hear this explanation; but he hoped the gentleman would now repair the injury, by publishing to his constituents the whole letter. Here I will give the whole:

"TO THE PUBLIC.

"FELLOW-CITIZENS: Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few of the calumnies which are in circulation concerning me.

"I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the *ardent friend of human liberty.* At the age of 18, *I became a member of an Abolition society* established at Richmond, Virginia, the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves, and *procure their freedom by every legal means.* My venerable friend Judge Gatch, of Clermont county, was also a member of that society, and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. *The obligations which I then came under I have faithfully performed.* I have been the means of liberating many slaves, but *never placed one in bondage.* I deny that my votes in Congress, in relation to Missouri and Arkansas, are in the least incompatible with these principles. *Congress had no more legal or constitutional right to emancipate the negroes in those sections of Louisiana, without the consent of their owners, than they have to free those of Kentucky.* These people were secured in their property by a solemn covenant with France when the country was purchased from that Power. To prohibit the emigration of citizens of the Southern States to the part of the country, the situation and climate of which was peculiarly suited to them, would have been highly unjust, as it had been purchased out of the common fund. Particularly, too, when it is recollected that all the immense territory to the Northwest of the Ohio had been ceded by Virginia, and that with an unexampled liberality, she had herself proposed, by excluding slavery from it, to secure it for the emigration of those States which had no slaves. Was it proper, then, when her reserved territory was in a great measure filled up, to exclude her citizens from every part of the territory purchased out of the common fund? *I was the first person to introduce into Congress the proposition that all the country above Missouri,* (which having no inhabitants was free from the objection made to Missouri and Arkansas,) *should never have slavery admitted into it. I repeat what I have before said, that as our Union was only effected by mutual concession, so only can it be preserved.*

"*My vote against the restriction of Missouri in forming her constitution was not a conclusive one; there would have been time enough, had I continued to be a member, before the question was decided, for my constituents to have instructed me, and I should have rejoiced in any opportunity of sacrificing my seat to my principles, if they had instructed me, in opposition to my construction of the constitution.* Like many other members from the non-slaveholding States, of whom I mention Shaw, Holmes, Mason of Massachusetts, Lanman of Connecticut, and Baldwin of Pensylvania, I could see nothing in the constitution which I had sworn to support to warrant such an interference with the rights of the States, and which had never before been attempted. And where is the crime in one set of men not being able to interpret the constitution as other men interpret it? *As we had all sworn to support it, the crime would have been in giving it a construction which our consciences would not sanction.* And let me ask for what good is this question again brought up? It has been settled as all our family differences have been settled, on the firm basis of mutual compromise. And patriotism, as well as prudence devoted the effects of that *awful discussion* to eternal oblivion. Is it not known that from that cause the great fabric of our Union was shaken to its foundation? Is it not known that Missouri would not have submitted to the restriction, and that the other slaveholding States had determined to support her? But for this compromise, the probability is, that at this moment we might look upon the opposite shore of Ohio, not for an affectionate sister State, but an armed an implacable rival. What patriotic man would not join the gallant *Eaton* in execrating the *head and the hand* that could devise and execute a scheme productive of a calamity so awful?

"Upon *the whole, fellow-citizens,* our path is a plain one; it is *that marked* out as well by humanity as duty. We *cannot emancipate* the slaves of the other States without *their consent,* but by producing a convulsion which *would undo us all.* For this much-to-be-desired event, we must wait the slow but certain progress of those good principles which are everywhere gaining ground, and which assuredly will ultimately prevail.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON."

This society in Richmond, Virginia, was in existence in 1791,—many Revolutionary patriots were members of it. Every man of sense knows, that in the abolition societies, as they now are, no abolitionists could live comfortably in Virginia at this time. Harrison was then about 18 years old; at 19 he was in Wayne's army, with a commission from Washington. But weigh well the whole language of this letter. Does he repent of his support of the rights of the slaveholding States? Nothing like it. He says, he would have rejoiced in an opportunity of sacrificing his seat to his principles, if he had been instructed in opposition to his construction of the constitution. He repeats, "we cannot emancipate the slaves of the other States, without their consent, but by producing a convulsion which would undo us all." Is this the language of an abolitionist? He asks, "what patriotic man, would not join the gallant Eaton, in execrating the head and hand that could devise and execute a scheme, productive of a calamity so awful." This, sir, is the language of one who had risked his life for his country.

The next cause of complaint against General Harrison by abolitionists, is his speech at Cheviot, 1833.

I give as much of this speech as relates to slavery, at length.

Extracts from General Harrison's speech at Cheviot, Ohio, July 4, 1833.

"There is, however, a subject now beginning to agitate them, [the Southern States,] in relation to which, if their alarm has any foundation, the relative situation in which they may stand to some of the States, will be the very reverse to what it now is. I allude to a supposed disposition in some individuals in the non-slaveholding States to interfere with the slave population of the other States, for the purpose of forcing their emancipation. *I do not call your attention to this subject, fellow-citizens, from the apprehension that there is a man among you who will lend his aid to a project so pregnant with mischief, and still less that there is a State in the Union which could be brought to give it any countenance.* But such are the feelings of our Southern brethren upon this subject—such their views, and their just views, of the evils which an inteference of this kind would bring upon them, that long before it would reach the point of receiving the sanction of a State, the evil of the attempt would be consummated, as far as we are concerned, by a dissolution of the Union. *If there is any principle of the constitution of the United States less disputable than any other, it is, that the slave population is under the exclusive control of the States which possess them.* If there is any measure likely to rivet the chains and blast the prospects of the negroes for emancipation, it is the interference of unauthorized persons. Can any one who is acquainted with the operations of the human mind doubt this? We have seen how restive our Southern brethren have been from a supposed violation of their political rights. *What must be the consequence of an acknowledged violation of these rights, (for every man of sense must admit it to be so,) conjoined with an insulting interference with their domestic concerns?*

"Shall I be accused of want of feeling for the slave, by these remarks? A further examination will elucidate the matter. *I take it for granted that no one will say that either the Government of the United States or those of the non-slaveholding States can interfere in any way with the right of property in the slaves.* Upon whom, then, are the efforts of the misguided and pretended friends of the slaves to operate? It must be either on the Governments of the slaveholding States, the individuals who hold them, or upon the slaves themselves. What are to be the arguments, what the means, by which they are to influence the two first of these? Is there a man vain enough to go to the land of Madison, of Macon, and of Crawford, and tell them that they either do not understand the principles of the moral and political rights of man; or that, understanding, they disregard them? Can they address an argument to the interest or fears of the enlightened population of the slave States, that has not occured to themselves a thousand and a thousand times? To whom, then, are they to address themselves but to the slaves? And what can be said to them, that will not lead to an indiscriminate slaughter of every age and sex, and ultimately to their own destruction? *Should there be an incarnate devil who has imagined with approbation such a catastrophe to his fellow-citizens as I have described, let him look to those for whose benefit he would produce it.* Particular sections of the country may be laid waste, all the crimes that infuriated man, under the influence of all the black passions of his nature can commit, may be perpetrated for a season; the tides of the ocean, however, will no more certainly change than that the flood of horrors will be arrested, and turned upon those who may get it in motion.

"*I will not stop to inquire into the motives of those who are engaged in this fatal and unconstitutional project.* There may be some who have embarked in it without properly considering its consequences, and who are actuated by benevolent and virtuous principles. But, if such there are, I am very certain that, should they continue their present course, their fellow-citizens will, ere long, 'curse the virtues which have undone their country.'

"Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer, that it has long been an object near my heart to see the whole of its surplus revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding the slaves, there appears to me to be no consututional objection to its being thus applied; embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis we might look forward to a day, not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave. To those who have rejected the plan of colonization, I would ask, if they have well weighed the consequences of emancipation without it? How long would the emancipated negroes remain satisfied with that? Would any one of the Southern States then (the negroes armed and organized) be able to resist their claims to a participation in all their political rights? Would it even stop there? Would they not claim admittance to all the social rights and privileges of a community in which, in some instances, they would compose the majority? Let those who take pleasure in the contemplation of such scenes as must inevitably follow, finish out the picture.

"*If I am correct in the principles here advanced, I support my assertion, that the discussion on the subject of emancipation in the non-slaveholding States, is equally injurious to the slaves and their masters, and that it has no sanction in the principles of the constitution.* I must not be understood to say, that there is any thing in that instrument which prohibits such discussion. I know there is not. But the man who believes that the claims which his fellow-citizens have upon him, are satisfied by adhering to the letter of the political contract that connect them, must have a very imperfect knowledge of the principles upon which our glorious Union was formed, and by which alone it can be maintained. I mean those feelings of regard and affection which were manifested in the first dawn of our Revolution, which induced every American to think that an injury inflicted upon his fellow-citizen, however distant his location, was an injury to himself; which made us, in effect, one people, before we had any paper contract; which induced the venerable Shelby, in the second war for independence, to leave the comforts which age required, to encounter the dangers and privations incident to a wilderness war; which drew from the same quarter the innumerable battalions of volunteers which preceded and followed him; and from the banks of the distant Appomattox, that band of youthful heroes, which has immortalized the appellation by which it was distinguished. Those worthy sons of immortal sires did not stop to inquire into the alleged injustice and immorality of the Indian war. It was sufficient for them to learn their fellow-citizens were in danger, that the tomahawk and scalping-knife were suspended over the heads of the women and children of Ohio, to induce them to abandon the ease, and, in many instances, the luxury and splendor by which from infancy they had been surrounded, to encounter the fatigues and dangers of war, amidst the horrors of a Canadian winter."

This speech requires no comment. It has been garbled and made to bear a construction never intended by its author. Let it be borne in mind that this speech was made in 1833, *before* General Harrison had been nominated for the Presidency. He was requested not to allude to this subject; but the instinct of patriotism, the feelings of benevolence, a sense of duty to his country, operated on him with resistless force. In the midst of a people opposed to slavery—among non-slaveholders, he gives utterance to this language. On the 4th of July, with a heart full of the glorious recollections of that great day on which his father had signed the Declaration of Independence, turning his thoughts to his dear native land—the land of his kindred and friends—the land of Washington, Madison, and Henry—defying the suggestions of a cold, calculating prudence, he spurned the selfish proposal of non-committal, and reproved, in language worthy one who had often risked his life for his country, the attempts of those who were endeavoring to agitate the country upon the subject of abolition. Such conduct is beyond the reach of praise. I leave it to the American people to pronounce the eulogy.

The next cause of offence to abolitionists is General Harrison's Vincennes speech. This is the speech which abolitionists call "*infamous*" and notorious. I will give part of this speech with no other comment than this. It was made AFTER he was nominated for the Presidency. He knew he was beaten for Congress in 1822, on account of his votes upon the Missouri question; he knew there was great excitement in the country relative to the question of slavery; there was no necessity for an expression of his opinion, but again, in the midst of a non-slaveholding people, he repeats his censure of their illegal and unconstitutional attempts.

This letter has been published by the Cincinnati committee, who tell us General Harrison's opinions upon the exciting questions of the day have undergone no change.

Extracts from General Harrison's speech at Vincennes, Indiana, July 4, 1835.

"I have now, fellow-citizens, a few words more to say on another subject, and which is, in my opinion, of more importance than any other that is now in the course of discussion in any part of the Union. I allude to the societies which have been formed, and the movements of certain individuals, in some of the States, in relation to a portion of the population in others. The conduct of these persons is the more dangerous, because their object is masked under the garb of disinterestedness and benevolence; and their course vindicated by arguments and propositions which, in the abstract, no one can deny. But, however fascinating may be the dress with which their schemes are presented to their fellow-citizens, with whatever purity of intention they may have been formed and sustained, they will be found to carry in their train mischief to the whole Union, and horrors to a large portion of it, which it is probable some of the projectors and many of their supporters have never thought of; the latter, the first in the series of evils which are to spring from this source, are such as you have read of to have been perpetrated on the fair plains of Italy and Gaul by the Scythian hordes of Atilla and Alaric; and such as most of you apprehend upon that memorable night, when the tomahawks and war-clubs of the followers of Tecumseh were rattling in your suburbs. I regard not the disavowals of any such intention on the part of the authors of these schemes, since, upon the examination of the publications which have been made, they will be found to contain every fact and every argument which would have been used if such had been their objects. I am certain that there is not in this assembly one of these deluded men, and that there are few within the bounds of the State. If there are any, I would earnestly entreat them to forbear, to pause in their career, and deliberately consider the consequences of their conduct to the whole Union, to the States more immediately interested, and to those for whose benefit they profess to act. That the latter will be the victims of the weak, injudicious, presumptuous, and unconstitutional efforts to serve them, a thorough examination of the subject must convince them. The struggle (and struggle there must be) may commence with horrors such as I have described, but it will end with more firmly rivetting the chains, or in the utter extirpation of those whose cause they advocate. *Am I wrong, fellow-citizens, in applying the terms weak, presumptuous, and unconstitutioaal, to the measures of the emancipators?* A slight examination will, I think, show that I am not. In a vindication of the objects of a convention which was lately held in one of the towns of Ohio, which I saw in a newspaper, it was said that nothing more was intended than to produce a state of public feeling which would lead to an amendment of the constitution, authorizing the abolition of slavery in the United States. Now, can an amendment of the constitution be effected without the consent of the Southern States? What, then, is the proposition to be submitted to them? It is this: The present provisions of the constitution secure to you the right (a right which you held before it was made, and which you have never given up) to manage your domestic concerns in your own way; but as we are convinced that you do not manage them properly, we want you to put in the hands of the General Government, in the councils of which we have the majority, the control over these matters, the effect of which will be virtually to transfer the power from yours into our hands. Again, in some of the States, and in sections of others, the black population far exceeds that of the white. Some the emancipators propose an immediate abolition. What is the proposition, then, as it regards those States and parts of States, but the alternatives of amalgamation with the blacks, or an exchange of situations with them? Is there any man of common sense who does not believe that the emancipated blacks, being a majority, will not insist upon a full participation of political rights with the whites, and, when possessed of these, that they will not contend for a full share of social rights also? What but the extremity of weakness and folly could induce any one to think that such propositions as these could be listened to by a people so intelligent as those of the Southern States? Further, the emancipators generally declare that it is their intention to effect their object (although their acts contradict the assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slaveholders that the immediate emancipation of the slaves is called for both by moral obligation and sound policy. An unfledged youth at the moment of his leaving (indeed, in many instances before he has left it) his Theological Seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton, and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to States whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited?

"*But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional.* I do not say that there are any words in the constitution which forbid such discussions as they say they are engaged in. I know that there are not. And there is even an article which secures to the citizens the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the constitution it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed, and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these slavery was recognised, and they took care to have the right secured to them to follow and reclaim such of them as were

fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress passed under this power have provided punishment to any who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now, can any one believe that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provides a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should at the same time authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass resolutions and adopt addresses, not only to encourage the slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so? I insist that, if the citizens of the non-slaveholding States can avail themselves of the article of the constitution which prohibits the restriction of speech or of the press, to publish any thing injurious to the rights of the slaveholding States, they can go to the extreme that I have mentioned, and effect any thing further which writing or speaking could effect. But, fellow-citizens, these are not the principles of the constitution. Such a construction would defeat one of the great objects of its formation, which was that of securing the peace and harmony of the States which were parties to it. The liberty of speech and of the press were given as the most effectual means to preserve to each and every citizen their own rights, and to the States the rights which appertained to them at the time of its adoption.

"It could never have been expected that it would be used by the citizens of one portion of the States for the purpose of depriving those of another portion of the rghts, which they had reserved at the adoption of the constitution, and in the exercise of which none but themselves have any concern or interest. If slavery is an evil, (and no one more readily acknowledges it than I do,) the evil is with them. If there is guilt in it, the guilt is theirs, not ours, *since neither the States where it does not exist, nor the Government of the United States, can, without usurpation of power and the violation of a solemn compact, do any thing to remove it without the consent of thos who are immediately interested.* With that consent, there is not a man in the whole world who would more willingly contribute his aid to accomplish it than I would. If my vote could effect it, every surplus dollar in the Treasury should be appropriated to that object. But they will neither ask for aid nor consent to be aided, so long as the illegal, persecuting, and dangerous movements are in progress of which I complain; the interest of all concerned requires that these should be immediately stopped. This can only be done by the force of public opinion, and that cannot too soon be brought into operation. Every movement which is made by the abolitionists in the non-slaveholding States is viewed by our Southern brethren as an attack upon their rights, and which, if persisted in, must in the end eradicate those feelings of attachment and affection between the citizens of all the States which were produced by a community of interests and dangers in the war of the Revolution, which was the foundation of our happy Union, and by a continuance of which it alone can be preserved. I entreat you, then, fellow-citizens, to frown upon the measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinions which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them here, knowing that, even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received."

Surely, sir, this is enough to satisfy any patriot; enough to convince any man whose better judgment is not clouded by loco-focoism. The Southern man who can read these speeches, and pronounce Harrison an abolitionist, has no sense of gratitude and no regard for truth. There are office-holders enough paid to vilify him. It is an agreeable and becoming task for the "medicine man" of his party, (Mr. DUNCAN,) and for the Senator from Ohio.

But this is not all. I hold in my hand General Harrison letter to Mr. Sloo of New Orleans, of a later date than his Vincennes speech:

From the New Orleans Bee.

"GENERAL HARRISON—ABOLITION.—The following letter was writen by General Harrison to a gentleman well known to the people of this city:

"'CINCINNATI, *November* 26, 1836.

"'MY DEAR SIR: I answer the question you proposed to me this morning, with great pleasure.

"'1st. I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the States, or *in any manner interfere with the property of the citizens in their slaves*, but upon the application of the States, in which case, and in no other, they might appropriate money to aid the States so applying to get rid of their slaves. These opinions I have always held, and this was the ground upon which I voted against the Missouri restriction in the 15th Congress. The opinions given above are precisely those which were entertained by Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson.

"'2d. *I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the States of Virginia and Maryland, and the people of the District.*

"'I received a letter some time since from John M. Berrien, Esq., of Georgia, proposing questions similar to those made by you, and I answered them more at length than I have now done, but to the same import.

"'In haste, yours truly,

"'W. H. HARRISON.

"'TO THOMAS SLOO, JR., *of New Orleans, now in Cincinnati.*'

"These were the sentiments of General Harrison less than four years ago. They were written *after* the last Presidential election, and refer to similar opinions written to Judge Berrien *before* that election."

Judge Berrien, in a letter dated the 11th April, 1840, confirms this statement: he says, "General Harrison denied the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the States, or in the District of Columbia."

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HOPKINS) proposes to address letters to General Harrison and Mr. Van Buren, calling upon them for an expression of their opinions. Both their opinions are known. Mr. Van Buren admits Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia: General Harrison denies it. Sir, I would as soon think of questioning the gentleman himself, or any other man on this floor, as General Harrison. The gentleman, however, has some excuse; he was a few months since opposed to this corrupt Administration. He has, as one of the investigating committee, contributed to expose this Administration for its culpable negligence. The evidence is before us in this bill, that they keep incompetent men in office. But the gentleman ought to remember, all men do not change with as much facility as he does. General Harrison, when he voted with the South in 1819, was more than forty years old. He was capable of forming an opinion then. In 1822, he told his constituents his constitutional opinion forced him to give that vote; he told them he had sworn to support the constitution, and it would have been a crime not to have done so.

At Cheviot in 1833, at Vincennes in 1835, in his letters to Messrs. Berrien and Sloo, he repeats his long-cherished opinions. Is it not ridiculous to suppose he has changed his opinion? Does not the question carry insult with it? If he was so weak minded, or if he was so much of a Van Buren man, as to be capable of changing his opinions upon a great constitutional question, might he not change again before November?

I have now furnished abundant evidence of the hostility of abolitionists to General Harrison, and have also given the cause of that hostility. I leave it to the sound judgment of the American people. I fear not the opinion of any honest searcher after truth.

Mr. VAN BUREN'S ABOLITION.

I wish now to contrast his opinions and conduct with General Harrison's. Mr. Van Buren has been called a "Northern man with Southern principles;" not so called by his enemies, but by friends who are trying to strengthen him in the South.

I have referred before to his vote in the Senate of New York, when the Missouri question agitated the whole country, but I will give it again.

The following resolution was introduced in the Senate of New York:

"PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION.—Whereas the inhibiting of the further extension of slavery in these United States is a subject of deep concern to the people of this State; and whereas we consider slavery as an evil much to be deplored, and that every constitutional barrier should be interposed to prevent its further extension; and that the constitution of the United States clearly giving Congress the right to require of new States not comprehended within the original boundaries of the United States, the prohibiting of slavery as a condition of their admission into the Union: therefore,

"*Resolved*, (if the honorable Senate concur therein,) That our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to oppose the admission as a State into the Union of any Territory not comprised as aforesaid, making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission.

"On the 29th January, 1820, the Senate took up the resolution and passed the same unanimously, the following Senators being present:

"Messrs. Adams, Austin, Barnum, Bartow, Browne, Childs, Dudley, Dayton, Ditmiss, Evans, Forthington, Hammond, Hart, Livingston, Loundsberry, McMartin, Moons, Mallory, Moore, Noyes, Paine, Ross, Rosencrantz, Skinner, Swan, VAN BUREN, Wilson, Young—29."

Here was evidence of "Southern principles!" Observe the date; Missouri was not admitted. In 1819, the bill failed, on account of opposition to slavery. And when this awful discussion threatened a dissolution of the Union, Martin Van Buren, was adding fuel to the flame.

In 1821, he voted to allow free negroes the right of suffrage. Another evidence of "Southern principle."

In 1822, in the Senate of the United States, there was a bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Florida. I copy the following from the journals of the Senate:

"The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Florida; and, the bill having been amended, it was reported to the House accordingly; and,

"On the question to concur in the amendment to the 11th section, to strike out, after the word 'freedom,' in the 14th line thereof, the residue of said section, as follows:

"'No slave or slaves shall, directly or indirectly, be introduced into the said Territory, except by a citizen of the United States removing into the said Territory for actual settlement, and being, at the time of such removal, *bona fide* owner of such slave or slaves; or any citizen of the United States travelling into the said Territory with any servant or servants, not exceeding two; and every slave imported or brought into the said Territory, contrary to the provisions of this act, shall thereupon be entitled to and receive his or her freedom.'

"It was determined in the affirmative: Yeas 23, nays 20.

"On motion by Mr. Mills,

"The yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

"Those who voted in the affirmative are,

"Messrs. Barbour of Va., Benton of Mo., Brown of Lou., D'Wolf of R. I., Eaton of Tenn., Elliott of Ga., Gaillard of S. C., Holmes of Miss., Johnson of Ken., Johnson of Lou., King of Ala., Lloyd of Md., Macon N. C., Noble of Ia., Pleasants of Va., Smith of S. C., Southard of N. J., Stokes of N. C., Van Dyke of Del., Walker of Ala., Ware of Ga., Williams of Miss., Williams of Ten.

"Those who voted in the negative are,

"Messrs. Barton of Mo., Boardman of Conn., Brown of Ohio, Chandler of Me., Dickerson of N. J., Findlay of Penn., Holmes of Me., King of N. Y., Knight of R. I., Lanman of Conn., Lowrie of Penn., Mills of Mass., Morril of N. H., Otis of Mass., Palmer of Vt., Parrott of N. H., Ruggles of Ohio, Seymour of Vt., Thomas of Ill., VAN BUREN of N. Y."

Mr. Van Buren and his colleague, Mr. King, who was the leader of those that opposed the admission of Missouri, voted against the Senators Macon and Stokes from North Carolina, and other Southern Senators. He voted against striking out this restriction. Another "Southern principle" vote.

And what has he done for the South? He admits in his letter to several gentlemen in North Carolina, that Congress has the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia! What wonderful attachment for "Southern principles!" How well calculated to excite the enthusiasm of *the* "Southern chivalry!"

(In a late letter to a gentleman in North Carolina, Mr. Van Buren says his opinions are unchanged.)

Let the comparison be made between him and General Harrison.

But what other "*Southern principles*" has Mr. Van Buren? Are his tariff votes "Southern?" *He voted for the tariff of* 1824.

He voted for the tariff of 1828, called the "bill of abominations." I learn from the Journal that Mr. Hayne moved "that the bill be postponed indefinitely." Messrs. Berrien, Branch, Hayne, *Macon*, Tazwell, and Tyler, voting to postpone, and Messrs. Benton, Johnson of Ky., and *Van Buren* voting against it. On the question "shall the bill pass as amended," it was determined in the affirmative. Mr. Van Buren voting for the bill, and the Southern gentlemen I have mentioned voting against it. Yet he is called in compliment, "a Northern man with Southern principles." He not only voted for these tariffs, but when in the State of New York, in 1827, he was accused of dodging a vote on the woollen bill. On the 10th of July, 1827, before a meeting in Albany, held to send delegates to a tariff convention, he gave his reason in full. He not only advocated a tariff for revenue, but for "*protection.*"

"Mr. Van Buren said that, having now stated, as fully as the time would admit, his general views upon the subject, his opinion of the *settled policy* of the State as to the propriety and expediency of affording *legislative protection* to the manufacturing interests of the country, by temperate and wise, and therefore salutary laws, and *his readiness to aid in the passage of all such laws*, he would trespass for a few moments," &c.

And, to afford another instance of his "Southern principles," so worthy the ad-

miration of "all the chivalry," I quote the following patriotic reasons for his supporting a tariff. Mr. Van Buren said:

"He owed many thanks to the meeting for the very kind attention with which he had been listened to by gentlemen, between many of whom and himself there had, upon public matters, been differences of opinion of long standing. ☞His situation in reference to the wool-growing interest was well known to most of them. He had at present invested more than $20,000 in SHEEP, and farms devoted, and which he meant to devote, to that business. He felt all proper concern for his own interest, and would, of course, cheerfully unite in all suitable measures for its advantage."☜

What a candidate for gentlemen advocating "Southern principles!" Twenty thousand dollars in sheep and farms, thirteen years ago, must have increased by this time, and as he is well known to feel "all proper concern for his own interest," he is unquestionably a tariff man now. Well may a man so rich in sheep and lands sneer at the candidate of the hard-cider and log-cabin men!

Sir, Mr. Van Buren may boast of his "proper concern" for his own interest; he has never shown any concern for the interests of his country. This nation, left so "prosperous and happy" by General Jackson, has been convulsed with distress since Mr. Van Buren has presided over its destinies. He has never suggested any thing for the alleviation of our sufferings. He does not acknowledge he is bound to do any thing for the country. Let the Government take care of itself; all communities are apt to expect too much, is the consolation we receive from the sheep candidate of "Southern principles." But the people are coming to the rescue. They will take a farmer from his plough, who, although he has not invested twenty thousand dollars in sheep, though he has not at the public expense visited the King of England, though his sons have not been to visit Queen Victoria, and been treated like lords, among dukes, earls, and princes of the earth, yet he is one of the people. His life has been spent in the service of his country. His life has been often risked for that country. His friends do not advocate his election as a "Northern man with Southern principles," or a Western man with Eastern principles, but as an American with American principles, which he has supported with unwavering fidelity.

Mr. Chairman, I have detained the committee longer than I expected. If this debate has been irregular and out of time, it is not my fault. The example was set by the Administration. Charges have been made which I felt it a duty to expose. Slanders have been started here which I felt bound to detect, which I have refuted. When this irregular debate commenced, I rose in my seat and protested against it. The Administration party allowed and encouraged it. Let them take the responsibility.

Sir, I hold the President responsible before the American people, for the agitation of this subject. The Globe, which he reads daily, supported by his patronage, the official authorized expositor of his opinions, is incessantly endeavoring to excite the Southern country upon this subject. Continual efforts are made by this paper, to array one portion of our people against the other. It spares no pains to create sectional differences. The President can control this at his will. If he believes there is no danger to be apprehended, why does he not say so? If he believes there is danger, why has he not raised his voice against the abolitionists? Why could he not last summer, when travelling in New York, take occasion to say to them, as Harrison did at Cheviot and at Vincennes, that their measures were presumptuous and unconstitutional? When he addressed his democratic fellow-citizens at Castle Garden, could he not have said a word of reproof? Why has he not introduced the subject into his message to Congress? Is it because a "proper concern for his own interests," requires him to devote his considerations to his large investments in sheep and farms?

Sir, I have never believed there was any danger to be apprehended from abolitionists; I have always told my constituents so. I believe a large majority of our Northern people are devotedly attached to our glorious Union; I believe a large majority are disposed to protect our constitutional rights; I *know* they are. The subject gives me no uneasiness. The people cannot always be duped. The

whig party—the true democratic party of this country—have determined to resist the monstrous schemes of this corrupt Administration. Against the sub-Treasury—the Executive mammoth bank—with their proposal, so appalling to a republican heart, for raising an army of two hundred thousand men, we are now contending.

We offer a well-tried patriot—well tried in the field and in the councils of the nation—to lead us on to victory. He is identified with the people. His interests are our interests. Having spent the larger portion of his life among the poor, he feels for them. He is pledged to serve but one term. He will not be electioneering, or trying to elect a successor after he is elected. Believing, if elected, he can have no other object in view than his country's good, we offer him to the people as the candidate of reform.

We raise our banner; our watchword is, "*There's no such word as fail.*" And "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence," we cheerfully leave the issue in the hands of the American people.

Every abolition paper affords additional evidence of the unmitigated hostility of abolitionists to General Harrison. The Emancipator is incessant and bitter in its attacks. This paper, as late as May 12, contains the proceedings of the annual meeting of the abolitionists; in which General Harrison is denounced.

The Philanthropist, of Cincinnati, of May 12, publishes a letter from David Gwyn and John C. Wright, to a locofoco in Illinois, who asked them for General Harrison's opinions relative to slavery. This letter states: "For a correct and full understanding of General Harrison's views, upon the different subjects referred to in your letter, we call your attention to his Vincennes speech, in 1835." If this committee are of any authority, the Vincennes speech is still adhered to. The Philanthropist remarks of this: "At one period, we could hardly persuade ourselves that, at this time of day, General Harrison would endorse the abominable sentiments contained in that speech. But we find ourselves mistaken." The same paper says, General Harrison has been "bending in base obeisance before the moloch of slavery," and "all the good he has done cannot palliate such conduct."

GENERAL HARRISON, A MEMBER OF AN ABOLITION SOCIETY—EXPLAINED.

A late number of the Richmond Whig contained a letter from Tarlton Woodson Pleasants, of the county of Goochland, in Virginia; in which Mr. Pleasants states, about the year 1798, he was "a member of a society in Richmond called the 'Humane Society.'" *Robert Pleasants, of Curles, was president of the society.* The object of this association was, in conjunction with the parent society in Philadelphia, "*to aid in abolishing the slave trade, and to assist negroes who are illegally held in bondage to obtain their rights through the courts of justice.*" Mr. Pleasants also says he was a delegate from the society in Richmond to a convention in Philadelphia; and that a very lengthy discussion took place upon the slave trade; that "this was the principal subject before the convention. If the abolition of slavery in the United States was alluded to at all I do not recollect it."

Mr. Pleasants states further, "I have no doubt this was the very society of which he was a member, about which so much has latterly been said in the public journals. I should have stated that General James Wood was vice president of the Richmond society."

It will be observed that it is stated in this letter, that "Robert Pleasants, of Curles, was president of the society." When General Harrison was in Richmond, in 1836, he said *Robert Pleasants, of Curles*, was president of this humane society. Thus is this, like all other charges against General Harrison, satisfactorily explained.

But I am able to throw additional light upon this subject. I have obtained a copy of the "minutes of the proceedings" of the convention of delegates which assembled at Philadelphia in 1797. I have looked through these proceedings, and there is not the slightest evidence of any design of interfering with the rights of the slaveholding States. The proceedings of this convention fully sustain Mr. Tarlton Woodson Pleasants in his statement. Delegates were in attendance from the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, from *Baltimore, Richmond*, and *Alexandria.* No man can be foolish enough to suppose that societies could be formed in Baltimore, Richmond, and Alexandria, in the midst of slaveholders, and appoint delegates to consult upon the propriety of abolishing slavery, as abolitionists now propose.

At this convention, in 1797, a committee was appointed, "to whom was referred the several communications made to the convention, and who were directed to consider what objects are proper for the attention of the convention."

The committee, of which the delegates from Baltimore, Richmond, and Alexandria were members, recommended to the convention, "to address a letter, or memorial, to the Secretary of State of the United States," "and to inform him of the attempts made, by citizens of the United States to evade the law, prohibiting our citizens from supplying foreign countries with slaves, by clandestinely using the Danish flag and registers, and praying such aid and interference of the Government of the United States, with the Court of Denmark, or with other Governments under

whose authority such practices now obtain, as may consist with propriety," &c. The convention, in this, was sustained by the Southern members. They asked nothing in this which it would be wrong to ask at this day. The principal object the convention had in view was, to put a stop to the slave trade, which was forbidden by the laws of the United States, and to aid, *by suits in courts of justice*, the emancipation of such slaves as had once been liberated and were afterwards unjustly and unlawfully reduced to slavery.

This seems to have been the "very head and front of their offending."

There is another fact which explains most satisfactorily their proceedings, and affords a justification to this convention. They were entirely different in their objects and feelings from abolitionists of the present day.

They did not assemble, officiously and impertinently, to devise ways and means for taking away their neighbors' property, nor did they propose or intend, by issuing inflammatory pamphlets, to excite insurrection. At this time, as appears from the pamphlet to which I have referred, the States of New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey were *slaveholding States*. Whatever measures, therefore, were adopted by this convention must have operated on themselves—must have affected their own rights, and the welfare of their own neighbors, kinkred, and friends.

The convention publish "abstracts of the existing laws respecting slavery in the States represented in the convention." I quote some of these, as published by the convention in 1797.

By the existing laws of Connecticut

"Any negro, mulatto, or Indian, servant or slave, who shall be found wandering out of the bounds of the place to which he belongs, without a pass from a magistrate or from his owner, shall be treated as a runaway; and citizens are empowered to secure such persons, and bring them before the magistrate, the owner being liable for all charges accruing thereby.

"Ferrymen are required not to suffer such persons to pass their ferries, under penalty of twenty shillings, for each offence, to the owner. And if free negroes shall be out without such certificate, and be stopped or taken up, they shall pay all charges arising thereby.

"Any person presuming to buy or receive from an Indian, mulatto, or negro servant or slave, any money or goods, without order from the owner, shall be sentenced to restore all such articles, and also forfeit double the value thereof, and treble if the article is not to be obtained. And if the person so offending do not make restitution as awarded, then to be publicly whipped, not exceeding twenty stripes, or make satisfaction by service.

"Any servant or slave, as above, if found from home after 10 o'clock at night, may be taken before a magistrate, who may order him or her to be whipped on the naked body, not exceeding ten stripes, and pay cost of court, unless redeemed by the master's paying a fine not exceeding ten shillings. And any person entertaining or tolerating any such persons in his house, after such hour, shall forfeit ten shillings."

The laws of New-York.

"Any slave striking a white person may be committed by a justice of the peace, and be tried and suffer the punishment inflicted for petit larceny.

"No person shall harbor a runaway slave, or trade with a slave without consent of the owner, under the penalty of five pounds.

"Slaves convicted of any crime, under a capital offence, may, on the request of the owner, and at the discretion of the court, be transported out of the State."

The laws of New Jersey,

at the same period, forbid any slave "to carry any gun or pistol, or take any dog with him, into the woods or plantations, unless accompanied by his owner, or some other white person by order of his owner."

The laws of this State also forbid the trafficking with any negro, Indian, or mulatto slave, without the consent of the owner, &c.; and authorized the taking up and whipping any slave that may be found five miles from his master's or mistress's habitation, &c.

The laws of New Jersey also forbid, under penalties, the harboring or entertaining any slave without the consent of the master, &c.

The laws of Pennsylvania.

It was within the borders of this State that the convention met. Pennsylvania was then a slaveholding State, and the extracts from her laws show—

"Trials of negroes and mulattoes shall be the same as of other persons; but the evidence of a slave shall not be admitted against a freeman.

"When sentence of death shall be executed against a slave, the master shall be indemnified for the loss."

By the laws of the same State it was enacted that "slaves belonging to members of Congress, foreign ministers, and consuls, and of persons passing through the State, should not be detained;" and it was expressly enacted that "no shelter or relief should be given to runaways from slavery or servitude."

Abolition societies in those days were not what they are now. And if North and South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee, should assemble a convention within their borders, composed of men from slaveholding States alone, to consult upon any matter relating to slavery, who would call them abolitionists!

39 W

WERT BOOKBINDING
JAN 1989
Grantville, PA